DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 176 604 HE 011 513

AUTHOR Arreola, Raoul A.
TITLE Essential Components of a Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System.
PUB DATE 79
NOTE 27p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Calculation; *College Faculty; *Evaluation Methods; Faculty Development; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; Rating Scales; *Teacher Evaluation; Tenure

ABSTRACT

In response to an increasing demand for faculty evaluation, focus is on elements of a successful evaluation program. It is suggested that faculty must be consulted in order to arrive at a mutually agreed upon structure, incorporating such areas as which sources should provide the information or data on which the evaluation will be based. Another consideration is the aspect of functional validity--how to insure that the instrument will be accepted and used by the faculty or institution. In order to assure that functional validity exists, a faculty role model must be established that the majority of the faculty believes to be an appropriate one for the institution. Among the roles generally established by faculty are advising, teaching, faculty service, research, and professional status. Once functional validity is determined, psychometric validity can be established with accepted measurement and validation techniques. The next step is the development of a procedure to produce a singular index that is readily interpretable and will provide information that can be utilized for promotion, tenure, and merit-pay decisions. In order to allow for individual differences in faculty assignments while still allowing for comparison, a series of steps is outlined. An equation is presented which permits the overall composite rating of a faculty member to be computed in order to arrive at a merit pay increase based on the faculty evaluation procedure. (PHR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE 011513

AUG 13 1979

ED176604

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Raoul Arreola

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ESSENTIAL COMPONENTS OF A COMPREHENSIVE FACULTY EVALUATION SYSTEM

Raoul A. Arreola
Florida State University

1424 Oldfield Drive
Tallahassee, Florida 32312
(904) 385-2993

HE011513

In many institutions of higher education today there is a pressing and immediate need to establish some form of faculty evaluation program or system. In many cases the primary impetus for an institution entering into the arena of faculty evaluation is a mandate from the state legislature, the board of regents, the institution's president, or some other like controlling authority. Whatever the source, a directive is issued, a committee appointed, and a group of faculty and/or administrators finds itself in the position of having to design and implement a faculty evaluation program post haste.

A common error made by such groups or committees charged with developing a faculty evaluation program is to begin by designing a student rating form or student evaluation questionnaire. This is a trap that is easily fallen into mainly because the bulk of the literature in the area of faculty evaluation focuses on the qualities, characteristics, advantages, virtues, faults, and shortcomings of student ratings. Although student ratings of faculty performance are certainly one essential component of a comprehensive faculty evaluation system, they are by no means the only, or even necessarily the most important component (Costin, et. al., 1971; Doyle, 1975; Miller, 1974). Additionally, beginning the development of a faculty evaluation program with the design and implementation of a student rating form calls forth a host of criticisms based primarily upon the issue of the validity of student ratings in the evaluation of faculty performance, and thus

jeopardizes the success of the entire faculty evaluation effort. There is a better way to go about designing and developing a faculty evaluation program.

Strategy for Success

Overcoming faculty resistance to the implementation of a faculty evaluation program can be a serious problem necessitating the utilization of a variety of strategies desgined to promote acceptance (Grasha, 1977). Faculty members generally not only meet the introduction of faculty evaluation systems with something less than enthusiasm, but, in fact, are often overtly hostile to the idea. This is especially the case when the most visible first element of the faculty evaluation system is a student rating form. The key to overcoming this resistance on the part of the faculty, indeed the key to avoiding the generation of much of the resistance in the first place, is to involve the faculty in the design of the system (Genova, et. al., 1976). Fortunately, a procedure may be employed which not only involves the faculty in the design of the system, but which also produces a system that has the greatest probability of being valid and useful as well.

The greatest resistance to faculty evaluation systems of any sort, whether they rely on student rating forms, peer evaluations, or simply the judgment of an administrator, derives from the fact that the fundamental values held by those doing the evaluating may not match the values of those being evaluated. In some cases, the values of those doing the evaluating are unknown or at least unstated or vague. Evalua-

tion is an act which requires that the person doing the evaluating apply a structure of values to a set of data or information, and thus make a judgment as to the worth of the thing or action being evaluated. Much of the criticisms of faculty evaluation systems or programs can ultimately be traced to a fundamental situation wherein the person being evaluated either disagrees with, or is unsure of, the value structure of the evaluator. In other words, questions concerning the validity of various components of a faculty evaluation system or program are basically reducible to differences or doubts concerning the assumed value structure of the evaluator.

Therefore, the first step, and indeed the first critical element, in designing a comprehensive faculty evaluation system, is to arrive at a mutually agreed upon value structure for the insitution, college, or department. That is, the following basic questions must be answered for and by the faculty as a whole:

1. What aspects of faculty performance <u>should</u> be evaluated?
2. What source or sources should provide the information or data upon which the evaluation will be based?
3. How much weight or value should be placed on the information provided by each source?
4. What <u>kind</u> of information should be gathered from each source?
5. How should the information be gathered (i.e., what forms, procedures, or protocols need to be developed)?

Determining the Faculty Role Model and Faculty Value Structure

A critical truth often overlooked or not recognized by measurement and evaluation specialists in designing questionnaires, forms, or procedures for faculty evaluation systems is the fact that the design and implementation of a successful faculty evaluation program is as much a political process as it is a technical or psychometric one. Much time and effort is spent agonizing over the validity of student ratings, the validity of peer evaluations, and the validity of the entire evaluation process. The literature abounds with research attempts to validate one form or another. Although these are serious and important questions, the most important form of validity is what might be called "functional validity". That is, regardless of the statistical and psychometric characteristics that a form or procedure might possess, if it is not accepted and used by the faculty or institution, it has no "functional validity" or practical utility.

Of primary issue here is how to go about establishing the functional validity of the forms and procedures of a comprehensive faculty evaluation system. It is assumed that once the functional validity of a system has been established and the system is operating, the issue of the psychometric validity of the various components of the system can be tackled with accepted measurement and validation techniques. To take these steps in reverse order, as is often the case, one stands a very good chance of becoming bogged down in the psychometric equivalent of such questions as "How many angels can dance on the head of a pin?", while the pressures which originally mandated a faculty evaluation

program build to the point where someone else finally designs and implements a system disliked by everyone.

In order to answer the questions noted earlier, it is necessary to obtain certain information from the faculty as a whole. That is, it is necessary to determine the faculty role model which the majority of the faculty believes to be an appropriate one for the institution. Additionally, the value structure of the faculty regarding the entire set of issues pertaining to what is important enough to be evaluated, and by whom, needs to be determined. Various faculty role models differ from institution to institution, with the most common models employing the traditional basic Teaching-Research-Service roles. A more comprehensive treatment of possible roles can be found in the work of Miller (1972).

Briefly, the roles which have emerged and some of the activities which define these roles are as follows:

A. Advising
    1. Advising students on programs of study
    2. Sponsor or advise student groups
    3. Chair Master's or Doctoral supervisory committees
    4. Serve on Master's or Doctoral supervisory committees

B. Teaching
    1. Teaching regular course offerings
    2. Developing course materials
    3. Developing replicable systems of instruction

C. Faculty Service

1. Serving on departmental, college, or university committees
2. Serving on the faculty senate

D. Administration and Management

1. Directing or managing an administrative unit
2. Program or project management

E. The Arts

1. Presenting recitals
2. Staging, directing or acting in musical, theatrical, and dance productions
3. Exhibiting paintings, sculptures, and other creative arts

F. Publications

1. Books
2. Journal and magazine articles
3. Monographs, etc.

G. Public Service (within the faculty member's area of expertise)

1. Serving on local, state, or national committees
2. Holding public office

H. Research

1. Basic scientific investigations, both theoretical and applied
2. Investigations of educationally relevant problems

I. Professional Status

1. Activity in professional organizations
2. Awards, honors, or invited presentations

Obviously, the brief listings of activities under each role heading shown are only meant to be representative and suggestive, and should not be considered as complete definitions of each role. It is best that each institution set up faculty committees or faculty workshops in the initial stages of the development of a faculty evaluation system to determine which activities the faculty consider appropriate for defining each role.

Several efforts have been made at combining the definition of faculty roles with a uniform value structure for an institution. W. R. Harper College in Palatine, Illinois, has developed a source-by-role weighting matrix in an attempt to begin reflecting values of the faculty in its evaluation system (Genova, et. al., 1976). Jackson State Community College in Jackson, Tennessee, and Piedmont Technical College in Greenwood, South Carolina, have also undertaken extensive efforts to ascertain and develop evaluation procedures which reflect the values of the faculty (Jackson State Community College, 1978; Piedmont Technical College, 1979). The form shown in Figure 1b, with its suggested cover memo in Figure 1a, are samples of composite forms which may be employed in obtaining role definitional and faculty value information on which the faculty evaluation system may be based.

Insert Figures 1a and 1b about here

Designing Data Gathering Strategies

Once the elements which constitute the roles in the faculty role

model appropriate to the institution have been defined, and the appropriate data sources and values associated with each data source have been determined, it is possible to begin designing the required data gathering strategies. In order to have an integrated faculty evaluation system which will provide information that can be utilized for promotion, tenure, and merit-pay decisions, it is useful to develop a procedure which produces a singular index which is readily interpretable. To produce such an index, it is only necessary to design all data gathering strategies such that the data they produce can ultimately be expressed on the same numerical scale. Thus, if one of the data gathering strategies requires a rating form; another, an interview; and another, a checklist; the information from each of these devices or strategies must finally be expressed on the same scale.

The following example will demonstrate the principles involved in applying the procedures discussed to this point in the development of a comprehensive faculty evaluation system.

EXAMPLE:

Assume that we wish to evaluate the Teaching role of the faculty. The first task is to determine what specific activities <u>should</u> be evaluated. This was accomplished by asking faculty to describe the activities which constitute Teaching in their view. The following definition emerged:

<u>Teaching</u>

a. Classroom performance (enthusiasm, clarity of exposition, organization, etc.)

b. Material preparation (syllabus construction, tests constructed appropriately, effective handouts, etc.)

c. Record keeping (turns in grades on time, orders text, files drop/add and withdrawal slips, etc.)

Using a form such as the one shown in Figure 1b, the faculty were also asked to indicate how much weight should be placed on the data or information provided by each data source listed. The faculty were also asked to indicate how much weight or value should be placed on the input by the various sources relative to the specific activities within the Teaching role. The general overall figures for the faculty as a whole derived by this procedure were as follows:

"How much weight should be placed on the input of the various sources relative to the total evaluation of the Teaching role?"

Teaching	Students	Peers	Self	Dept. Chair
Total Weights	75%	15%	5%	5%

"Of the weights listed above, how should the weights be distributed across specific Teaching activities?"

Teaching				
a. Classroom Performance	50%		2%	
b. Materials Preparation	25%	15%	2%	
c. Record Keeping			1%	5%
Totals	75%	15%	5%	5%

From the above total weights we can see that the faculty have expressed the value that 75% of the weight of the evaluation of their teaching should be placed on the information provided by students, and that the 75% should be distributed as 50% on information concerning classroom performance, with the remaining 25% on material preparation. Thus, in designing our data gathering strategy for the Teaching role, it will be necessary to develop some sort of questionnaire or other form to determine the student's reactions to not only classroom performance, but to the materials prepared and used by the instructor in the course, as well. Other data gathering strategies, such as interviewing all or perhaps a select representative few students from the class, are also possibilities.

As can be seen in the figures above, the faculty in our hypothetical institution have determined that the input from peers concerning the Teaching role should be focused mainly on the quality of the materials prepared and used in the course. Accordingly, some protocol or format must be developed that would permit peers to evaluate or judge appropriate aspects of syllabi, tests, handouts, etc. This information-gathering strategy may be as detailed as specifying form, style, technique, or any of a number of other characteristics of the material, or it may be as general as simply being an overall set of guidelines for determining the value of the materials produced.

The strategy for obtaining information from the individual faculty member on the various elements of teaching may range from highly specific questions concerning intent and instructional design strategies to something as general as global self-ratings.

Finally, in our example the department chair is required to provide input as to the record-keeping component of the faculty member's overall teaching performance. The information gathering strategy here could be as detailed as a comprehensive checklist that the chair completes, or as simple as a form requiring only a handful of simple responses to basic procedural questions that the departmental secretary would complete.

In any case, all of the above data gathering forms, procedures, or protocols would ultimately be recorded on a common scale. Assuming a 1 to 5 scale with "1" being the lowest rating and "5" being the highest, all information from the various sources would be translated into the common 1 to 5 scale. Note that the critical point in this example is not how a specific form, questionnaire, or procedure is designed, but rather the utilization of the various data gathering or measurement strategies in an integrated system which reflects the value structure of the faculty in the overall evaluation process. Thus, even though individual instruments or forms may be designed and implemented before their psychometric validity has been completely researched, the system as a whole will have "functional validity", since the results of

the evaluations carried out should be more readily accepted by the faculty owing to the fact that the system reflects their values concerning what should be evaluated and by whom and to what degree.

It should be stressed that in the example above the issue of the specific validity of the particular instruments, forms, or questionnaires is not being ignored. Rather, concern for those questions is placed in the proper perspective and dealt with in an appropriate sequence so as to maximize the successful design and implementation of the entire faculty evaluation system. In a like manner as described in the example, information gathering or measurement strategies could be designed for each role and for each data source concerning that role. It is unlikely, in a realistic setting, that any institution implementing a faculty evaluation system will have sufficient lead time to develop each instrument or strategy to such a degree that all questions concerning its psychometric characteristics (validity, reliability, etc.) will have been satisfactorily answered before being implemented. The determination of these characteristics takes a good deal of time and research. However, it is recognized that institutions must often implement a faculty evaluation system with whatever they have been able to develop in an extremely short length of time. The above described system will permit such an implementation with even the most basic and elemental forms of measurement instruments or strategies, since the

critical components are not forms or questionnaires, but the value placed on the information provided. These values will reflect the faculty's collective values and thus the results of the system are more likely to be accepted and used.

Individualizing the System

Assuming that we have determined the value structure of the faculty in regards to the various roles to be evaluated, and by whom, and further assuming that all forms, protocols, and information gathering strategies have been designed so as to result in ratings on a common scale, we arrive at the problem of how to take into account different faculty assignments. Given the diversity of possible activities in which faculty may legitimately engage (as described earlier), the problem of evaluation revolves around the determination of the answers to the following questions:

A. Which criteria (activities) is a faculty member to be held accountable for?

B. How can a faculty member be evaluated in a manner that assesses performance only on those criteria, yet permits comparison with other faculty whose chosen or assigned activities (criteria) may differ?

The following steps suggest a method for answering these questions:

A. Determining Criteria

1. Each faculty member would, in conjunction with the

appropriate contracting agent (i.e., Dean, Dept. Chair, etc.), come to an agreement as to which combination of roles or activities would comprise the contractual responsibilities for the coming academic year.

2. As part of the agreement, there would be an additional determination and agreement as to the percentage of total weight which would be assigned to each role in the overall evaluation of the individual. Possible minimum and maximum weights for each role would have already been determined by the faculty and administration as a matter of policy, and each individual assignment would have to fit within those guidelines. For example, if the institution determined that at least 50% of a faculty member's overall performance evaluation must derive from the teaching role, no faculty member could choose to weight this role less than 50%.
3. In the event that the contractual responsibilities or the relative degree of emphasis or commitment to those responsibilities should change substantially during the year; either at the request of the appropriate contracting agent, or the faculty member concerned, an evaluation of the performance to that point should be carried out within a reasonable amount of time. Any subsequent evaluation made on the adjusted contractual agreements should date from the time of the change.

B. Evaluation of Selected Roles in Criteria

With the determination of the criteria for which a faculty member is to be held accountable, the evaluation of his or her performance would be totally individualized to the extent that the faculty member would be evaluated only on those activities agreed to and contracted for. In addition, the evaluation of a specific activity or role would be weighted in direct proportion to the agreed upon emphasis placed on that activity. An individual's evaluation would thus reflect the extent to which the assigned responsibilities and duties had been carried out regardless of what they might be. In this manner, comparisons among faculty would be made on a singular index of success in their endeavors, rather than trying to force their evaluations into a common role model.

Specifically, the evaluation system would employ various forms of rating devices, peer evaluations, student ratings, self-evaluations and supervisory evaluations, or combinations thereof, deemed appropriate to assess each activity. Commercial rating scales and evaluative devices could be used if desired in evaluating many facets of faculty performance. However, as suggested earlier, the faculty and administration (and perhaps students, too) should be involved in the formulation of specific evaluation strategies. All evaluation or data-gathering devices, however, result in a single numerical index expressed

on a common scale which reflects the extent to which the faculty met the criteria agreed upon. The indices of performance would then be weighted according to the pre-assigned weights and a composite weighted index of performance would result. This composite index would then be comparable across all faculty, regardless of the specific criteria against which they were all being evaluated.

C. EXAMPLE: Computing the Composite Role Rating

Assuming as in our earlier example that the faculty for an institution had determined that for the Teaching role, 75% of the weight of the total evaluation would be placed on the input from students, 15% from peers, 5% from self, and 5% from the department chair, the composite rating for the Teaching role would be computed as follows:

Suppose, on a scale of 1 to 5, with 5 being high, we obtain the following ratings for an instructor on the Teaching role.

Students..... 4

Peers..... 5

Self..... 3

Dept. Chair..... 3

To obtain the Composite Role Rating, we multiply each individual rating by the specified weight for each data source. In actual practice, some form of standard score would be used instead of the raw rating so as to minimize the accumulation

of error in the over-all ratings. The raw ratings are used here only for the purposes of clarity.

Students.....	4 x 75%	=	3.00
Peers.....	5 x 15%	=	.75
Self.....	3 x 5%	=	.15
Dept. Chair.....	3 x 5%	=	.15
Composite Role Rating		=	4.05

For the remainder of the example, assume that all Composite Ratings for each role have been computed in like fashion.

Assume that Professor Jones has selected the following activities or roles and the corresponding weights for his contractual responsibilities:

Teaching.....	50%
Research.....	10%
Faculty Service.....	25%
Administration.....	15%

Further, assume that all evaluation devices or data-gathering strategies used to rate his performance in each role share the common scale of 1 to 5 where "1" represents a minimal rating and "5" represents a maximal one, and that all Composite Role Ratings are computed in the fashion shown above. Upon being rated in each role, Professor Jones receives the following total evaluation:

ROLE	WEIGHT		COMPOSITE RATING		WEIGHTED RATING
Teaching	50%	X	4.05	=	2.025
Research	10%	X	3.75	=	.375
Faculty Services	25%	X	3.50	=	.875
Administration	15%	X	3.00	=	.450
	OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING			=	3.725

Similarly, Professor Smith has roles, weights, and ratings of:

ROLE	WEIGHT		COMPOSITE RATING		WEIGHTED RATING
Teaching	50%	X	3.75	=	1.875
Research	40%	X	4.25	=	1.700
Publications	10%	X	4.75	=	.475
	OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING			=	4.050

Thus, even though both faculty have somewhat different assignments, with differential weights being given their various roles, the OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING of 3.725 for Professor Jones compared against the OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING of 4.05 for Professor Smith indicates that Professor Smith has been perceived and adjudged as achieving greater success in her endeavors than Professor Jones.

Therefore, as illustrated above, each faculty member may select different and individualized criteria against which to be evaluated while still enabling comparisons with other faculty members when such

comparisons are necessary for promotion and tenure decisions.

Evaluations and Merit Pay

It may be argued that the system described above results in rating figures that imply a precision of measurement which is not practically possible. It should be noted, nowever, that the OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING figures reflect not only the ratings given by individuals on various roles, but also the value structure of the faculty. It is this value structure which is being reflected with precision in composite ratings carried out to two or three decimal places. It should be remembered that each Composite Role Rating is comprised of several different measures from several different sources, and thus accuracy in the OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING is, I believe, both warranted and necessary. In addition, such accuracy becomes useful when we wish to utilize the OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING for the determination of merit pay increases.

The following equation can be used to compute merit pay based upon a faculty member's OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING:

$$\text{RAISE} = \text{MERIT UNIT} \times \text{OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING}$$

Where: $$\text{MERIT UNIT} = \frac{\text{TOTAL MERIT MONEY AVAILABLE IN RAISE POOL}}{\text{GRAND TOTAL OF ALL ELIGIBLE OVERALL COMPOSITE RATINGS}}$$

To use this equation, certain assumptions must be made. Assuming, first, that we are using a common rating scale (in our example, a 1 to 5 scale), and further assuming that it has been determined as a matter of

policy that any faculty members obtaining an OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING of between 1.000 and 1.999 are not eligible for merit raises (since such ratings would be reflective of below satisfactory performance), the equation would be used as follows:

1. The total monies available for the raise pool would be determined by the customary, present budgetary procedures. For the purposes of notation, this total merit money is designated TMM.
2. The OVERALL COMPOSITE RATINGS of all eligible faculty (i.e., faculty with OVERALL COMPOSITE RATINGS of 2.000 or higher), would be summed to produce the Grand Total of all OVERALL COMPOSITE RATINGS and is designated as GTR.
3. The total merit money (TMM) would be divided by the grand total of the eligible ratings (GTR) to produce the Merit Unit (MU).
4. To determine an individual's merit raise, his OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING (OCR) would be multiplied by the Merit Unit (MU). This leads to the equation:

$$\text{RAISE} = \text{MU} \times \text{OCR}, \quad \text{Where:} \quad \text{MU} = \frac{\text{TMM}}{\text{GTR}}$$

The following is an example of an application of the formula:

Suppose that a given department with 10 faculty members is given a raise pool of $10,000.00. Further, suppose that only 7 of the 10 faculty have OVERALL COMPOSITE RATINGS of 2.000 or greater, and that the sum of all these seven OCR's is 26.92.

First, the Merit Unit (MU) for the department is computed:

$$MU = \frac{TMM}{GTR} \qquad MU = \frac{\$10,000}{26.92} \qquad MU = \$371.47$$

Thus, for Professor Jones, with his OVERALL COMPOSITE RATING of 3.725, we would compute a raise of:

$$RAISE = MU \times OCR \qquad RAISE = \$371.47 \times 3.725$$

$$RAISE = \$1,383.73$$

While Professor Smith, with her OCR of 4.05, would receive a raise of:

$$RAISE = MU \times OCR \qquad RAISE = \$371.47 \times 4.05$$

$$RAISE = \$1,504.45$$

Utilizing the above system and equations, merit raises can be tied directly to evaluations in a manner that should be viewed as fair and equitable. Note that under this system, no single administrator is solely responsible for determining who gets how much of a raise. Input has been received from a variety of sources concerning the performance of faculty in a number of different roles, and the resultant ratings directly influence the raises awarded. This system in no way hinders the responsible administrator from reinforcing or rewarding departments as a whole, since this can be accomplished by providing larger raise pools to the department.

Conclusion

What have been outlined in this discussion are merely the highlights of a procedure which, in various forms, can and has been successfully developed by the author in several colleges and universities around the country. Needless to say, not all aspects of the system have been dealt with in great detail owing to a lack of space in the present format. Obviously missing is a detailed outline of the development of the policies and operating procedures which must be built along with the system, as well as a discussion of cost and the organizational structures necessary to run it. However, the system permits such a degree of flexibility, and, in fact, encourages and promotes individualization in its application, that it should be possible to implement in any of a large number of institutional and organizational settings.

FIGURE 1a.

MEMORANDUM

TO: All Faculty

In order to assist us in designing a faculty evaluation system that is valid, fair, and equitable to all faculty being evaluated, it is necessary that we determine the answers to the following questions:

1. What should be the relative weight placed on each of the roles faculty play in the evaluation of overall performance?

2. What specific activities define each role?

3. From whom should the information be gathered concerning your performance in each role?

4. How much value or weight should be placed on the information provided by each source in the determination of your overall evaluation?

To determine the answers to these questions, we ask that you fill out the matrix on the following page with the information requested below:

1. In the parentheses next to each faculty role listed indicate the MINIMUM weight that should be placed on that role in the evaluation process. For example, under the TEACHING role, if you believe that every faculty member's total evaluation should be weighted <u>at least</u> 50% on his or her teaching performance, place "50" in the parentheses.

2. In the space underneath each role heading, list some of the activities which you believe <u>should</u> define or determine that role.

3. In the cells under the columns headed STUDENTS, PEERS, SELF, DEPT. CHAIR, and OTHER, indicate the percentage of weight which should be placed on the input or information provided by each source relative to each role or activity for the purposes of evaluation. For example, under the TEACHING role, if you believe what students report about your teaching performance should weigh the heaviest in the evaluation of your teaching, you may choose to place 75% under STUDENTS, 10% under PEERS, 5% under SELF, and 10% under DEPT. CHAIR. If, on the other hand, you believe that what your PEERS and ALUMNI report concerning your teaching should be weighted most heavily, you may wish to distribute the weights in some manner such as 10% under STUDENTS, 60% under PEERS, 5% under SELF, 5% under DEPT. CHAIR, and 20% under OTHER (ALUMNI).

Thank you for your cooperation in assisting in the design of our faculty evaluation system.

FIGURE 1b.

ROLES	SOURCES OF INFORMATION				
	STUDENTS	PEERS	SELF	DEPT. CHAIR	OTHER Specify
( ) ADVISING					
1.					
2.					
3.					
( ) TEACHING					
1.					
2.					
3.					
( ) FACULTY SERVICE					
1.					
2.					
3.					
( ) ADMINISTRATION					
1.					
2.					
3.					
( ) PUBLIC SERVICE					
1.					
2.					
3.					
( ) RESEARCH					
1.					
2.					
3.					
( ) PUBLICATIONS					
1.					
2.					
3.					
( ) THE ARTS					
1.					
2.					
3.					
( ) PROFESSIONAL STATUS					
1.					
2.					
3.					

REFERENCES

Costin, F., Greenough, W.T., and Menges, R.J., "Student Ratings of College Teaching: Reliability, Validity, and Usefulness," Review of Educational Research, 41 (1971) 511 - 535

Genova, W.J., Madoff, M.K., Chin, R., and Thomas, G.B., Mutual Benefit Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education, Ballinger Publishing Co., Cambridge, Mass. 1976

Grasha, Anthony F., Assessing and Developing Faculty Performance: Principles and Models, Communication and Education Associates, Cincinnati, Ohio 1977

Jackson State Community College, Comprehensive Faculty Evaluation System, Jackson State Community College, Jackson, Tennessee, 1978

Piedmont Technical College, Institutional Directive 3-9, Piedmont Technical College, Greenwood, South Carolina, 1979

Miller, Richard I., Evaluating Faculty Performance, Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco, 1972

Miller, Richard I., Developing Programs for Faculty Evaluation: A Source Book, Jossey-Bass Inc., San Francisco, 1974